

have had plenty of room in a country school-house. And under the efforts of such powerful minds, each one looked his neighbor in the face, and seemed to say, "Go to! it helps not, means not, we are dead." And from the corner of the fence, where the audience sat, and from the shade of the apple-tree, where the speakers stood, came the echo—dead, dead! So we "parted in silence"—I, thinking by the way, that the *Era* might revive many, if in their possession.

Jonesville, Saratoga county, New York, Aug. 28.—The cause of freedom in this vicinity seems to be onward. Everybody thinks that our nomination of Hale is a capital one, so that we may thank God, take courage, and go to work with renewed energy.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1852.

"FATHER ROSS'S ANGEL," an allegory from the pen of ELIZA L. SPROUT, published on the first page of the *Era*, contains passages of exquisite beauty. The great Truth taught in an old one—what Truth is not old—but the illustrations are her own, and quite unique. Miss Sprout hereafter will make her appearance in our columns more frequently.

RECOLLECT.

That after the 30th of this month, the postage of the *Era*, if paid in advance, for any distance, will be only 26 cents a year, or 6 1/2 cents quarterly.

AND RECOLLECT, too, that payment of postage in advance may be made at the office where the paper is delivered.

CAMPION CLUBS.

At the earnest solicitation of numerous friends, and hoping to enlarge still more rapidly the circle of anti-slavery readers, and that they may be kept fully advised of the political doings during the present campaign, we have concluded to offer the *Era* to clubs for four months, which will embrace the whole period of the campaign, and the time during which official results will be made public, on the following terms:

Ten copies will be sent from the 1st of September to the 1st of January, for Five Dollars;—the person making up the club being entitled to an extra copy.

THE CANVASS.

In our recent travels in New York and New England, we should not have known, from any indications of popular feeling, that a Presidential election was pending. No enthusiasm prevailed among the masses, no anxiety was manifested as to the result of the contest; nobody seemed to imagine that the price of stocks, the course of trade, the great interests of the country, would be more affected by the success of one Party than of the other. The general impression was, that there was no longer any issue of importance between them; that the questions which had divided them were substantially settled, and that whatever might be the popular decision on the claims of their candidates, the policy of the country would remain unchanged.

This prevailing indifference was not shared by those who had taken a special interest in the question of Slavery. It was felt by them that on this question both the old parties had taken ground adversely to Northern Sentiment. The liberal Democrat was humbled at the position of his party, disgusted with the platform, and cold towards the candidates; the liberal Whig could no longer plead that his was the true Anti-Slavery Party, and whenever he would speak for his candidates, was gagged at his acceptance of the miserable Pro-Slavery platform.

Such was the condition of the political mind at the North recently. It may undergo a change. Members of Congress returning to their homes may kindle a little excitement among their constituents, but it will be hard work.

A contest between two Parties for place and power, where no political question of moment is involved, has no feature to commend it to intelligent, sober-minded men. It is without dignity; it naturally runs into low partisanship, and its appropriate weapons are misrepresentation and personalities. In the absence of any real topics relating to important interests, false reports and inflammatory appeals are constantly put forth, or the whole contest is made to turn upon the relative personal claims of candidates. Look at the manner in which the present campaign is carried on by managers in the Whig and Democratic Parties.

Their first effort is to propitiate the Slave Power, a sectional, exceptional, and odious interest, by striving to demonstrate the superior devotion of their respective candidates to its will and policy. Then, we have dissertations on the comparative bravery of Scott and Pierce, one party enlarging upon the fact that the latter fell from his horse just before an engagement, and never did any fighting at all; while the other triumphantly retorts that Scott would not fight Jackson. The Democrat talks of the kindness of heart and private benevolence of his candidate—the Whig boasts of the handsomeness of his, towards the wounded soldier in Mexico. The Whig gets out a series of pictures, of bloody fields and imminent death, in all of which Scott moves to and fro, conquering and unconquered. Forthwith the Democrat, in the columns of his monthly review, issues a series of caricatures, representing the conqueror in all sorts of grotesque, ridiculous, and degrading forms, calculated to awaken derision and contempt. And next follow investigations into the amount of money which each candidate has received from the Treasury, with a view to create the suspicion of extravagance, luxury, profligacy, or dishonesty, as few who read the schedule of expenses will take the trouble to inquire for what services the money has been paid.

Could there be a more ignoble warfare? Would men resort to a mode of electioneering so insulting to popular intelligence, and so demoralizing, did the cause they advocate admit of other arguments? Their conduct proves that there is no great political question in controversy between them.

Look now at the position and course of the Independent Democratic Organization. Its candidates and advocates resort to no such low expedients. They are not in the habit of indulging in personal abuse of their opponents, in miserable misrepresentation, in appeals to grovelling passion. That organization aims at objects affecting the interests and destinies of the country—the denationalization of Slavery, the placing of the Government, in its external and internal relations, uniformly on the side of Liberty, the securing of the Public Domain to actual settlers, and against monopoly and speculation, and the restoration of political power to the hands of the People wherever they have been deprived of it by the institution of intermediate bodies, intervening between the electors and the electors. Neither of the old parties occupies its ground upon these subjects, and it therefore has a controversy with both. The controversy is a great one, involves great principles, and rises above mere partisanship and political trickery. There is no motive, there is no temptation, to vituperation and misrepresentation. If the new Party succeed at all, it must succeed in virtue of its principles, on the

strength of the vast issues it presents to the People, and not by exaggerating the virtues of its candidates, or vilifying the character of their competitors.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE PARDONING POWER.

The pardon extended to Drayton and Sayres, by President Fillmore, is made the subject of bitter comment by the *Richmond (Va.) Examiner*. It says:

"Mr. Fillmore came into the Presidential mansion undeniably an Abolitionist. Since he has been there, his friends claim that he has been friendly to the South. But it is evident that he has made up his mind to go out as he came in, an Abolitionist of the worst kind. The explanation is easy. By curbing his propensities he hoped at one time to get a new nomination by means of Southern Votes. But the Baltimore Convention has put an end to his hopes. He has no longer a motive for concealment, no longer an incentive for hypocrisy; and so the clock falls at once. The author of the Buffalo Letter stands revealed in his own attire. The wolf has cast off his sheepskin. This Drayton and Sayres petition was the first opportunity he had to show his real nature since the Baltimore adjournment, and *ah! evasit, erupit!*—that is to say, he is off like a shot!"

This is all in bad taste and temper, and we are glad to see that the *Examiner* has failed to get up any excitement about the case. The slaves whom Drayton and Sayres attempted to carry off to a state of Freedom, were all recovered at very little cost to their owners.

Whatever opinion may be held of the expediency of the act, or of the general duty of respect for the law, it will be conceded on all hands that they did not intend to appropriate the slaves to their own use, were instigated by no feeling of malevolence towards their owners, but acted from benevolent motives.

They were poor men, with wives and children looking to them for bread. From them they were separated, and immured in jail, where they remained four years. Was not this enough to satisfy the demands of the slaveholders for protection to their peculiar interest? Did they wish to incorporate these men for life? No sentiment of the kind prevailed in the District.

Through the agency of a benevolent gentleman in Philadelphia, means were taken to secure the assent of a majority of the owners of the slaves attempted to be removed, to a release of their claims. The paper embodying their views was presented to the President, before the Whig Nominating Convention, and he made no secret of his desire to release the prisoners, provided the pardoning power extended to their case.

Mr. Sumner, who became deeply interested in the matter, and properly withheld petitions on the subject which he had been requested to present to the Senate, now devoted himself to the case, and prepared an admirable argument on the pardoning power, which he submitted to the President, and which came under the eye of the Attorney General, Mr. Crittenden, to whom the whole subject was referred. Not for a moment did Mr. Sumner lose sight of the affair; while some of his constituents were abusing him for neglecting his duty, he was attending to it, noiselessly, but effectually. The opinion of Mr. Crittenden was rendered, fully asserting the pardoning power of the Executive over the case; and Mr. Fillmore then, with the facts before him that a majority of the owners of the slaves had released their claims, and that none of the owners had lost his so-called "property," pardoned these men, permitting them, after an imprisonment of four years, to embrace once more their wives and children.

We may remark, in addition, that it is well understood in Washington, that, although the Attorney General is from Kentucky, and three other members of the Administration are from slaveholding States—North Carolina, Virginia, and Louisiana—not a single member dissented from this act of Executive clemency.

Mr. Fillmore has done no more than was done by Mr. Crittenden, when Governor of Kentucky, and by a Democratic Governor of the State of Missouri, who two or three years since released from the penitentiary Thompson and his companions.

The facts are before us. They show a fair case for the interposition of the President, and we see no sense or propriety in going behind the record in search of ignoble motives for an act of ordinary humanity.

One lesson should be learned from this affair by some of Mr. Sumner's constituents—and that is, that philanthropy may be effective without bluster, and sometimes best accomplish its end by "making haste slowly."

RAILROAD LINES TO PHILADELPHIA.

We lately had some experience of the tricks played upon travellers by the New Jersey Railroad and Transportation Company. Having arrived in New York from Boston, on board the splendid steamer Knickerbocker, by the Norwich and Worcester route, we had ourselves ticketed through to Washington, by the 9 o'clock train of cars. The promise was, that we should be put through, without further expense, to Washington, by half past 8 o'clock, P. M. The train was behind its time, without any necessity whatever. At a rate quickened two or three miles an hour, we should have arrived seasonably in Philadelphia. As it was, we reached the wharf ten minutes before two, and then had to ride two miles and a half to the depot, on Broad street, to take the 2 o'clock train to Baltimore! It was announced that the omnibuses provided by the Company could not carry the passengers there in that time; and so we put our family into a hack, as a desperate resort, hoping the train would delay five or ten minutes. We galloped all the way, got ahead of everybody else, and had the exquisite pleasure of seeing the smoke of the train, which had started a minute or two before! All that was left us now, was to make our way back as fast as possible to the boat, which, starting from Philadelphia at 3 o'clock, P. M., puts us in Baltimore at 10 o'clock. And in this way we reached Baltimore, so as to take the cars in the morning for Washington. The result was, instead of being in Washington at 8 o'clock that evening, according to the pledge of the New Jersey Railroad and Transportation Company, we did not reach there till the forenoon of the next day, and we were out of pocket, by the honest operation, just twelve dollars more than was in the contract, distributed among the hackmen, hotel keepers, and omnibus drivers, of Philadelphia and Baltimore.

Now, this is swindling, neither more nor less.

There was no reasonable cause for the failure to make the connection at Philadelphia, and no motive, unless to play into the hands of people who live upon travellers in Philadelphia and Baltimore. We advise our friends who may be travelling this way, if they would reach Washington in one day from New York, to take the 6 o'clock train, and shun the 9 o'clock train as a humbug.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF DOUBLE-DEALING.

The Washington *Union*, in reference to our article about the circulation of documents, says:

"The Democratic Committee has acted openly and honestly. All its documents are exposed to the public gaze. It has not spoken with a double tongue. It has not drawn two characters of Gen. Pierce—one for the North and the other for the South. It has not been guilty of inconsistency, nor evasion, nor concealment. It has never made two statements with regard to Gen. Pierce's views on slavery. It has made the same representation of his history in the North and in the South. To every portion of our people it has denied that Gen. Pierce had any sympathy for the Abolitionists, and everywhere it has denounced the New England libel, which was invented and circulated by the *Republic* and its allies, and used the evidence of the *National Era* and its partisans, and affiliated presses to prove its libellous character. When the Whig leaders in this city adopted the Abolition attack in order to effect the Northern mind, an important and significant movement was made—one which made it the duty of every honest organization to announce its character to the Southern people and to the country. We made that announcement through our columns; and the Democratic Committee made it, by publishing in pamphlet form an exact copy of the *National Era* article, with a preface explaining fully the object of the publication."

The *Union* fully confirms all that we stated. It said that the Whigs had circulated our record of Mr. Pierce in the North, and made the charge in such a way as to suggest some concert between them and us. We replied by denying all concert, and by charging that our record was purchased by Southern Democratic members of Congress for circulation under their frank in the South, printed in the *Union*, and in pamphlet form in the *Union* office, for circulation where it would suit their purposes. The *Union* admits the truth of our charge. Was there any concert in this transaction between us and the *Union* editors or Democratic Committee?

But says the *Union*, we have acted fairly and openly—making the same representation of General Pierce North and South. It may be so—we did not accuse it of double-dealing—only we should like to be informed whether this pamphlet edition of our record issued in the *Union* office, was circulated equally at the North and South, or chiefly in the South? As to printing it in the columns of the *Union*, everybody knows that the circulation of that paper is very limited in the North.

"The inquiry," says the *Union*, "consisted in speaking with a double tongue; for such speech is false always, and is never uttered but with the premeditated purpose to deceive and defraud. When Whig Congressmen and committee-men were sending the *Republic's* articles, made up with the assistance of Foss, Goodale, and Tuck, with the knowledge and understanding that other Whig Congressmen and committee-men were sending the North a document of a different character to array the Abolitionists against Gen. Pierce, the spectacle was a fraudulent one."

We understand that the charge of double-dealing is made, not against us, but the *Republic*, Whig Congressmen, and the Whig Committee. Of course, we have nothing to do with it. Let the parties accused recollect it if they choose.

This kind of double-dealing in politics is loathsome enough, but so common that it awakens no surprise. It is the result of the conflict of sectional prejudices, sectional sentiments, sectional interests, sectional institutions.

The system of Slave Labor, beggotten peculiar interests and opinions, prevails in one half of the country; the system of free labor, generating opposing opinions and interests, prevails in the other half; and yet the effort is to unite both sections, every four years, in the choice of Presidential candidates. How is this done? Not by fair, open, consistent dealing; for the candidate who explicitly avows himself in favor of the system of Slave Labor, and his purpose to secure its ascendancy in the councils of the Federal Government, cannot receive the support of the North, any more than the candidate who should avow himself in favor of the system of Free Labor, and his purpose to secure its ascendancy in the Federal Councils, could receive the support of the South. An unambiguous, notorious Pro-Slavery position would forfeit the vote of the former, as an unambiguous, notorious Anti-Slavery position would forfeit the support of the latter. The old parties and their managers know this, and yet look to both sections and the supporters of both systems, for favor to their Presidential candidates.

Now, we put it to any man of candor and common sense, what will be the course of such Parties, controlled by such necessities? Will they, can they, avoid double-dealing and evasion? In relation to Slavery, and all questions connected with it, each section will be plied with arguments which would work mischief in the other. It will not do to urge the claims of General Pierce in the North, because he is regarded in the South as more loyal than any other Northern politician to the interests of Slavery; nor would it promote Scott's prospects in the South, to republish the Anti-Slavery appeals of the New York *Tribune*. Facts will be admitted or suppressed, distorted, disparaged, or exaggerated, as the interests and prejudices of different sections may render expedient. Whenever you see a Nominating Convention passing vague or ambiguous resolutions, or no resolutions at all, upon questions of interest to the People, you may know that a convenient margin is left for any amount of electioneering falsification.

The position taken by the Independent Democratic organization exempts it from all temptation to double-dealing or evasion. Its Convention at Pittsburgh spoke out its creed in unmistakable terms, upon all questions that could interest the public in the present canvass, and its candidates are known to represent the views of the Convention. Independent Democracy has not two faces on the subjects of Slavery, River and Harbor Improvements, Land Reform, or Non-Intervention; nor have its candidates, nor its organs, nor its presses, nor its documents. They all speak one language, and that is so plain that he who runs may read. Hale, and Chase, and Sumner, are not driven by policy to declare a vote, for their position makes no dodging their true policy. Can we forget that, when the Senate was called upon to decide for or against the amendment of Mr. Sumner, prohibiting the payment of extraordinary expenses incurred in the execution of the infamous Fugitive Law, and providing for the repeal of that Law, both Mr. Seward and Mr. Davis found it convenient to absent themselves? The record contains many against repelling, four for it, but not the name of him who is held up by Slaveholding fanatics as the embodiment of all that is hateful in Northern Abolition, or of him honored so long by the appellation of "Honest John." Why were they absent? A vote for repeal

might have compromised their Presidential candidate; a vote against it, themselves. Do we wrong them? Their policy is the result of their position; the open, consistent, bold policy of Chase, Hale, and Sumner, is the legitimate result of theirs. But, what shall we say of *Wade*, who, though a Whig, voted like an Independent Democrat? Mere politicians may condemn him, but honest men will applaud an act of fidelity to Freedom in defiance of Party necessities.

THE THIRD CANDIDATE.

We have already stated that the Abolition organ in this city has announced Mr. Hale's acceptance of the Pittsburgh nomination. This is an important fact, which demands comment; for, if we understand it rightly, it is significant of the fate of the Whig party and forebodes party divisions for years to come.

Since the foundation of our Government, two different and distinct principles have struggled for the mastery. They have dictated different constructions of the Constitution, and have formed the opinions of men with regard to all the leading questions of public policy. From the beginning there have been men among us who distrusted the people, and who believed that the country should be governed by a few aristocratic monarchies, who embraced a cold, stationary, unenterprising conservatism, and who thought that all the acts of the citizen should be directed and controlled by the Government. On the other hand, there have been, from the first, men who believed in the virtue and intelligence of the people, and who held that a new policy was necessary for a new world, and that the true purpose of Government was the defence of the citizen from wrong, and then to leave him to pursue happiness according to the dictates of his own judgment. The issue between these two principles was first made up in the last few years of the last century, and from that time to the present the Democratic principle has triumphed in every fair encounter. The opposite influence has gained the control of the Government three times by false pretences; but in every instance the triumph has been short, and was followed by overwhelming condemnation. Hence it has naturally happened that the opposition to the general policy of the country under which our resources have been developed with such marvellous rapidity, representing all the elements of dissatisfaction, should resemble an agglomeration of factions rather than a legitimate political party. After the overthrow of the younger Adams, the Federalists constituted the strongest division of the opposition forces, and by contact and co-operation it imparted its centralizing principles to the other portions of the opposition. The abolition faction naturally leagued with Federalism; for, without the prevalence of Federal ideas in the administration of the Government, its objects could never be accomplished. The league between Federalism and fanaticism, to break down the veto power, and establish the supremacy of a Congressional majority, fully illustrates the nature of the attraction by which the Whig party of the North became thoroughly tainted with fanaticism. The distinct and differing interests of individuals, however, always kept alive an abolition organization outside of the Whig party—Washington *Union*.

We do not know who is the author of these profound observations, but they bear about the same relation to the politics of the present generation, as the cocked hat and short clothes of past times bear to its fashions. The true purpose of Government, he says, is "the defence of the citizen against wrong, and then to leave him to pursue happiness according to the dictates of his own judgment." We should like him to tell us how many of the sixty-four public acts, and fourteen public resolutions of Congress, at its late session, had for their main purpose "the defence of the citizen against wrong?" We recollect that one, and that was the Steamboat bill. The other acts and resolutions were designed to pay the expenses of the Government, to stimulate and sustain the enterprise of the States, to enhance the value of the public domain, to facilitate commerce, to promote intercourse among the people, and to secure a great variety of objects not coming within the general definition of "a defence of the citizen against wrong." The editors of the *Union* must put off their short clothes and cocked hats, and familiarize themselves with the usages and ideas of the nineteenth century.

Their theory of the affiliation of Abolition with Federalism is no better than their theory of Democracy.

What is Federalism, understood in a party sense? Centralization, carried to an extreme—a loose interpretation of the Constitution, with a view to accomplish ends not contemplated by the framers of that instrument—usurpation of powers by the Federal Government—disregard of the reserved rights of the States and of the People.

Let us take the two prominent, active forms of Abolitionism, so called, and see what natural affinity there is between them and Federalism. Mr. Garrison represents one form, but he is a thorough State Rights man. He contends that the Federal Constitution guarantees slavery—that the Union is its chief support—but does he look to "the prevalence of Federal ideas in the administration of the Government," for the accomplishment of his purposes? Does he invoke the Federal Government to put down Slavery? Far from it: on the contrary, believing it to be repugnant essential to Liberty, as Rhetts believes it at war with Slavery, he throws himself on State Rights doctrine, insists upon a dissolution of the Union, and secession, as the only true and honest remedy for the grievance of which he complains. Mr. Garrison and his party are *Secessionists*, not *Federalists*. They desire no league with Federalism, or with any body of men that sustains the Federal Union.

Take the other prominent form of Abolitionism—that represented by the Pittsburgh Convention. It was against centralization—it is strenuous for a rigorous interpretation of the Constitution—it struggles in defence of the reserved rights of the States and of the People—it discontemns the use of doubtful powers—it acknowledges the existence of no implied power, unless absolutely necessary to the exercise of a power expressly given—and, so far as slavery is concerned, its whole action is directed against a usurpation. It is "the prevalence of federal ideas in the administration of the Government" which it denounces, and which has made its existence necessary. Had it not been for the unholy league between Slavery and Federalism, there would have been no Liberty Party, no Buffalo movement, no Pittsburgh nomination. It was the alliance between the United States Bank and the Federal Government that led to the organization of the Democratic Party under its present form: it is the alliance between Slavery and the Federal Government that has led to the organization of the Independent Democracy. The former party sought to divorce the Government from Banking Institutions—this party seeks to divorce it from Slavery. The former said, let the People and States regulate and dispose of those Institutions; the latter says, let the People and States regulate and dispose of the system of Slavery.

We are determined fully to expose the outrageous falsification of the relative positions of the Slave Power and its organized opponents, so common in the columns of the *Union* and its affiliated prints. We seek no alliance with Federalism—we abhor it; but we do seek to break up the league formed between Federalism and Slavery-Fanaticism. Slavery, we assert, is a system, existing only under State authority, within State jurisdiction, in virtue of State laws. The Federal Constitution carefully

excludes the idea of property in human beings, and contains no grant of power to the Federal Government, to create, recognize, sustain, or legislate in behalf of Slavery. The laws sustaining it in the District of Columbia, regulating the coastwise slave trade, and making provision for the reclamation of fugitive slaves, find no warrant in the Constitution, and are the offspring of the league between Slavery and Federalism. For the same reason, if there be Slavery in New Mexico and Utah, it is in violation of the Constitution. We seek to denationalize Slavery—to decentralize it—to divorce the Federal Government totally from its support—to turn it over to the States in which it exists, and to establish within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Constitution, the Law of Personal Freedom. The accomplishment of this work will be the triumph of the Democratic idea and of the doctrine of State Rights over Federalism.

It is useless to keep up the game of misrepresentation—to continue to impute to a secret purpose to use the Supreme Judiciary or the Federal Government to abolish Slavery in the States. People are every day becoming convinced of the falsity of the charge. It is one thing to relieve the Nation or Union from the responsibility of maintaining Slavery, and quite another to impose on it the responsibility of abolishing Slavery in the States. The former act is constitutional, legitimate, and a high duty; the latter is not constitutional, not legitimate, not a duty. The States in which slavery exists must determine each for itself how to rid itself of the evil, under its responsibilities to God and to that Public Opinion from whose imperious demands neither the Despotism of the Throne nor that of the Plantation can release itself.

FROM THE TRUE DEMOCRAT.

TO THOMAS H. BENTON.

[Written 1850, while he was yet in the Senate, but long for the freedom of the Territories against the usurpations of Slavery. Reproduced on hearing of his return to Congress, the present month.]

God speed thee well, old Lion of the West! Holding the coward, traitor horse at bay. Frightening the clamorous hell-hounds from their prey. And baring to their fangs thy dauntless breast! Go on, old Hercules! thou Man of men! Strangling the towering monsters of our time; Thou hast some sin, but lost in fame beside. By thrusting the old Dragon in his den! Right worthy art thou of the mighty West—The West that brooks no pigmy in her sight; She bears no traitor brood upon her breast, And she will stay thee with her arm of might; And thou shalt meet applauding hands and hands From Maine's primeval woods to Eldorado's sands! Centreville, Ind., Aug. 1852. I. H. J.

DOCUMENTS.

As numerous complaints are received of the non-receipt of Documents ordered through the Secretary of the Independent Democratic Association of this District, we are desired to state that when it was proposed to send speeches, &c., through the Association, it was understood that a fund would be raised to enable it to keep a supply of Documents on hand, and distribute them as they might be wanted, at a trifling cost of printing them. The Association then advertised certain Documents for sale, supposing the fund would be raised as projected. But little money has been contributed, and the Association, instead of being able to keep a lot of Documents on hand, have been compelled to get them printed as they are wanted, and this they could not always get done as promptly as they desired; hence the delay in sending them. Again, many of those who have ordered Mr. Durkee's speech cannot be supplied, as the edition that was printed has been exhausted, and a sufficient number has not been ordered to authorize the issue of a new edition. Under these circumstances, the Association is compelled to send such Documents as it has on hand. The Secretary has endeavored to do his duty, but the Association is hampered for want of the "sinews of war." Persons who wish to aid the cause are solicited to contribute funds in aid of the Association without delay.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN MASSACHUSETTS.

The Democratic State Convention was held at Fitchburg, Massachusetts, on the 8th inst. The great majority of the delegates, representing the wishes of their constituents, were in favor of continuing the coalition with the Free-Soilers, as the only means of securing the State from Whig ascendancy. A small but active minority, caring more for consistency than success, or what is more probable, less for State politics than for the chances of patronage from a Democratic Administration at Washington, were anxious to break up the coalition. Of course, this was the question to be decided by the Convention. The Coalition Democrats assumed the entire control of the Convention, and determined the course of its proceedings. It swallowed the Baltimore platform and candidates, bodily, without even making a face at the monstrous compound; but the National Democrats were not satisfied with this. They wished the party purged of the baleful heresy of "Coalition," and demanded that the Convention should declare against the unclean thing in all its forms. But the Coalitionists frowned upon the demand, and voted down by a vast majority the resolution introduced by the minority, being determined to keep up a good understanding with the Free-Soilers.

They also nominated Henry W. Bishop (Coalitionist) for the office of Governor, and for electors at large, James Whittier, who, though a National, had resisted the attempt to dictate to the Party on the question of Coalition. The "National Democrats," a reduced band, then withdrew, and organized another Convention, by appointing I. D. Bradford President, and a large number of Vice Presidents and Secretaries.

A State Committee was appointed, and another committee was selected to report resolutions.

The Committee on Resolutions reported a series against coalition, which were adopted with great applause.

Speeches were made, denouncing the action of the regular Convention, and the Provisional Committee was empowered to call a Convention of the true Democracy, if it should be considered expedient. The Convention then dissolved.

A SPEECH.—The New York *Tribune* stigmatizes the Democratic Party as the "British" Party, on the ground that the Free Traders of England prefer the Tariff of 1846 to that of 1842; and the *Union* retorts, by calling the Whigs the British Party, because Blackwood's Tory Magazine charges the great prosperity of the United States upon the Democratic Tariff which the *Tribune* assails.

This is a pretty fair specimen of the profound wisdom with which the old party leaders are carrying on the campaign. The assumption is, that the American People generally are fools, and fond of clap-trap.

USE OF ALDERMEN.—The Providence *Journal* says the chief use of Aldermen in New York is to let rowdies out of prison; formerly, when a fellow was nabbed, his confederate sent him a file and chisel; but now they send him an Alderman.

LITERARY NOTICES.

THE AMERICAN WHIG REVIEW. September, 1852. New York: Champion Bissell, Publisher.

The September number contains its usual assortment of political and literary articles. The leading article discusses the "Movements of the Enemy," or Democracy, for the next four years, which are specified as follows:

1. Election of a strictly negative and pliable person to the Presidency, with an active anti-Mexican Cabinet.
2. Irritation of Mexico along the border, by various arrangements, easily understood and always efficacious.
3. Negotiations with Mexico, ending in a rupture.
4. War, lasting through two campaigns.
5. Contest between the Northern and Southern Democracy over the territory—division of the spoils.
6. By all of which, aided by the veto, the Whigs are to be kept in the background.

Lossing's *Field-Book of the Revolution* is severely reviewed, by a writer who finds it a good deal easier to condemn than to commend.

Somebody discusses, neither well nor wisely, on Charles Dickens, the *Black House*, International Copyright, &c. We do not see the sense of discussing this question of International Copyright in so dogmatical and denunciatory a tone as that which runs through this article. You may call the American publishers of foreign literature "pirates," but that is not argument—it will convince nobody—it answers no purpose, except to show the ill-breeding of the testy critic. The Whig reviewer is as lame in his argument as he is ready in vituperation. We are favorable to the establishment of an International Copyright, on an equitable basis, with proper limitations; but not because it will protect American brains against English competition. This, however, is the grand idea of the reviewer. So in love is he with a Protective Tariff, that he desires to see English intellect excluded by discriminatory duties, so as to bring into market the inferior intellect of the American! "We object," he says, "to seeing American periodicals smothered and overruled by English reprints; we object to see American readers taking their ideas from the minds of Englishmen; and we object to seeing the profession of literature in this country encumbered with the disabilities which the circulation of foreign literature produces." And so Government is to intermeddle, not only with the industry but the intellect of the country. It is not enough for it to prevent the People from buying their cloth or iron where it may suit them, but they must be obliged to give up the London Quarterly and Blackwood, and read instead, the pages of the *North American and Whig Review*! This is intermeddling protection with a vengeance.

We can tell the reviewer, if American prints cannot make head against foreign reprints, it is because they have not intellect enough—that is, one hundred thousand copies of Mrs. Stowe's novel have been sold, not because her genius or the market for its wares were quickened by Protection, but because the People will ever listen to the inspired utterance of true genius.

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW. July, 1852. Leonard Scott & Co., New York. For sale by Taylor & Maury.

After date, but still welcome. Its views of foreign affairs, presented in several articles, especially one on Piedmont, are exhibited with great force, and are in the main liberal and just. An article on English Agriculture goes into the subject with much care and considerable minuteness.

THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW. August, 1852. Published and for sale as above.

Among the topics discussed in this number are Romanism, Reform in the Church of England, and the Political Crisis in England. The American reader's attention will be arrested by an article on American Poetry, in which the reviewer passes judgment on Longfellow, Bryant, Read, and Poe. The writer is condescending, and somewhat conceited. He is severe on Longfellow, says nothing to excite his admiration in Bryant, praises Poe, thinks Read gives more promise than any American poet of whom he has heard, and takes the ground that all American Poetry is but an imitation—an imitation not of the best poets, but of the best class of modern English poets.

LOTUS EATING, a SHIBUBI ROMANCE. By George W. Curtis. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Mr. Curtis, in the author of "Nile Notes" and the "Howadij in Syria." The reputation won by those delightful works of travels, will not be impaired by this Summer Book, in which, in his peculiar style of word-painting, he describes Saratoga, Niagara, Newport, Catskill, and other popular places of resort.

For sale by Frank Taylor, Pennsylvania avenue, Washington, D. C.

ATLANTIC AND TRANSATLANTIC. Sketches Afloat and Ashore. By Captain McKinnon, R. N. Published and for sale as above.

The author, an adventurous, liberal, hearty Englishman, somewhat hasty and self-confident, but always on the look-out for something new, piquant, or characteristic, has given us a very pleasant account, in one volume, of a tour through the States, and to the remote settlements, "enlivened by curious statistics, anecdotes, incidents, and with reflections, sometimes just and natural, and sometimes forced and groundless."

LIFE AND PUBLIC SERVICES OF HENRY CLAY. By Epos Sargent. Auburn, N. Y.: Derby & Miller. For sale by R. Farnham, 154 avenue, Washington.

Mr. Sargent brings down the narrative of Mr. Clay's life to 1848, when Horace Greeley takes up the thread, and continues it to the time of the decease of that distinguished Senator. The volume closes with a selection from the speeches of Mr. Clay.

The work is full in its narrative, and glowing in its eulogy, as might be expected from the reverence for the character and profound sympathy with the opinions of Henry Clay, cherished by the biographers.

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW. July. Taylor & Maury, Agents.